

burden due to the separate classification of the 4 groups of the invention is rebuttable (M.P.E.P. §803).

Applicants assert that a search into prior art with regard to the invention of Groups I-IV is so related that separate significant search efforts should not be necessary. For example, a search directed at methods of producing secretory immunoglobulins would address the art relevant to the subject matter of each of Groups I-IV. Accordingly, there is no serious burden on the Examiner to collectively examine Groups I-IV of the subject application. Therefore, restriction is not proper under M.P.E.P. §803.

III. CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the restriction requirement. Applicants look forward to a favorable action on the merits. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call the Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Sherie L. Morrison et al.

By their attorneys,

GATES & COOPER

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: October 15, 1999

By: Kecady
Name: Karen S. Canady
Reg. No.: 39,927

KSC/io